

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 12

September 18, 2018

255 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Filosi v. Electric Boat Corp., 330 C 231	3
<i>Workers' compensation; collateral estoppel; claim for benefits under state Workers' Compensation Act (§ 31-275 et seq.) by plaintiff, who had been awarded benefits under federal Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. § 901 et seq.) following husband's death from lung cancer that allegedly was caused by workplace asbestos exposure; whether finding by administrative law judge in prior federal proceeding that decedent's workplace exposure to asbestos was substantial contributing cause of development of his lung cancer precluded defendant employer and defendant insurers from contesting issue of causation under state act; claim by defendants that they were not collaterally estopped from litigating causal connection between decedent's death and his workplace exposure to asbestos because federal act requires lower standard of causation than substantial factor standard required under state act.</i>	
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases	25

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Farrell v. Johnson & Johnson, 184 CA 685	3A
<i>Intentional misrepresentation; claim that trial court abused its discretion in permitting reference to former defendants; claim that trial court abused its discretion in excluding journal articles from evidence as inadmissible hearsay; whether trial court properly directed verdict for defendants on claim for innocent misrepresentation; whether innocent misrepresentation claims primarily apply to business transactions; claim that trial court abused its discretion in declining to instruct jury as requested by plaintiffs.</i>	
57 Broad Street Stamford, LLC v. Summer House Owners, LLC, 184 CA 834	152A
<i>Injunction; action seeking injunction restraining defendant from interfering with plaintiffs' alleged rights under certain easement; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant's construction of service access structure did not materially interfere with plaintiffs' reasonable use and enjoyment of easement; whether language of easement provided for full and unlimited access by large vehicles or prohibited construction of permanent structures within easement area; claim that trial court modified plaintiffs' easement rights in concluding that defendant had unilateral right to determine method, timing and location by which plaintiffs might use easement area; whether trial court properly construed language of easement; whether plaintiffs' assertion that entirety of easement area must be available to them comported with stricture of Stefanoni v. Duncan (282 Conn. 686), that use of easement be reasonable and as little burdensome to servient estate as possible; whether plaintiffs' interpretation that easement provided them with unlimited access was unreasonable under clear language of easement.</i>	
Jordan v. Biller, 184 CA 848	166A
<i>Trespass; license and view easement; claim that trial court improperly determined that view easement was not appurtenant to defendants' land; claim that trial court erred in awarding plaintiffs damages; whether trial court properly determined that view easement granted to previous owners of defendants' property was personal and did not run with land; whether view easement was proven to enhance value of defendants' property; whether there was lack of historical usage of ease-</i>	

(continued on next page)

ment; whether intent of parties expressed in language of bond for deed and license and view easement evidenced personal right instead of appurtenant easement that was intended to run with land; whether defendants overcame presumption that view easement, which did not expressly mention heirs and assigns of grantee, was not appurtenant.

- Kaye v. Housman, 184 CA 808 126A
Contracts; landlord-tenant; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to strike case from hearing in damages where defendant filed answer and special defenses, which plaintiff did not ask to be revised; claim that special defenses were part of answer and that defendant was in default on entire complaint for failing to revise eight of twelve special defenses; whether answer and special defenses have legally distinct functions; whether relevant rules of practice provide that special defenses are part of answer for purposes of default.
- Keusch v. Keusch, 184 CA 822. 140A
Dissolution of marriage; alimony and child support; whether trial court erroneously computed defendant's presumptive minimum child support obligation on basis of defendant's earning capacity; whether proper remedy was to remand matter for reconsideration of all of trial court's financial orders; whether trial court abused its discretion by ordering defendant to pay nonmodifiable unallocated alimony and child support.
- Marshall v. Commissioner of Correction, 184 CA 709 27A
Habeas corpus; burglary in second degree; burglary in first degree; assault in first degree; violation of probation; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner's trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance due to conflict of interest as result of counsel's prior representation of witness in unrelated criminal case; whether trial counsel actively represented conflicting interest that adversely affected trial counsel's performance; whether petitioner produced evidence that trial counsel received confidential information during representation of witness that would have affected petitioner's defense or limited trial counsel's ability to effectively cross-examine witness; whether there was sound tactical reason for trial counsel not to cross-examine witness with pending charges; whether habeas court properly determined that petitioner's trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance by failing to move to suppress witness' identification of petitioner from photographic array; whether trial counsel had reasonable basis to conclude that motion to suppress one or more photographic identifications of petitioner would not have been granted; whether petitioner demonstrated that trial counsel's performance was deficient or how petitioner was prejudiced thereby; whether habeas court properly determined that trial counsel did not provide ineffective assistance in failing to challenge consolidation of petitioner's two criminal cases for trial; whether trial counsel's decision to not oppose state's motion to consolidate was reasonable and founded on reasonable strategic grounds; reviewability of claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance in failing to object to trial court's exclusion of petitioner from participation in in-chambers conference.

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
 Office of Production and Distribution
 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
 ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
 Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

Rocco v. Shaikh, 184 CA 786.	104A
<i>Quiet title; discharge of invalid lien; claim that plaintiffs lacked standing to maintain statutory causes of action to quiet title (§ 47-31) and to discharge allegedly invalid lien (§§ 49-13 and 49-92e) against real property; whether claim that plaintiffs lacked standing to maintain statutory causes of action was moot; whether there was practical relief that could be afforded to defendants where title to subject property has vested in third party and defendants conceded that they had no legal or equitable right or interest in property; claim that trial court's judgment was procured by fraud; request for this court to exercise supervisory authority over administration of justice to reverse trial court's judgment.</i>	
State v. Walcott, 184 CA 863.	181A
<i>Violation of probation; unpreserved claim that there was insufficient evidence to support trial court's finding that defendant constructively possessed narcotics and revolver and, therefore, that court abused its discretion by considering that unproven fact during dispositional stage of revocation proceeding.</i>	
U.S. Bank National Assn. v. Eichten, 184 CA 727.	45A
<i>Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly rendered judgment of strict foreclosure; whether trial court improperly rendered summary judgment as to liability on complaint; whether trial court improperly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to whether defendant homeowner could prevail on her special defense of unclean hands; whether trial court improperly concluded that special defense of unclean hands was invalid because it did not relate to making, validity or enforcement of mortgage note; unpreserved claim that trial court erred in concluding that special defense of equitable estoppel failed to raise genuine issue of material fact as to whether plaintiff's loan servicer induced defendant to default on mortgage loan; claim that genuine issue of material fact existed as to breach of contract special defense, which was based on assertion that plaintiff's loan servicer created offer to defendant homeowner that her mortgage loan would be permanently modified if she timely made all payments under federal mortgage modification trial period plan; whether trial court improperly concluded that there was no genuine issue of material fact as to special defense of breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing, where loan servicer failed to offer loan modification under federal mortgage modification program; whether trial court properly concluded that special defense of promissory estoppel did not raise genuine issue of material fact, where plaintiff declined to modify defendant homeowner's mortgage loan after she made trial period plan payments; whether trial court improperly rendered summary judgment as to counterclaim that alleged that plaintiff breached contract that was formed when defendant homeowner complied with conditions of trial period plan; whether counterclaim satisfied transaction test in rule of practice (§ 10-10) that required counterclaim to have sufficient relationship to making, validity or enforcement of note or mortgage; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether plaintiff and defendant homeowner formed contract when defendant homeowner complied with conditions of trial period plan; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether plaintiff's loan servicer was permitted to continue to review defendant homeowner's financial eligibility for federal loan modification program after end of trial period plan; claim that trial court improperly determined that contract defendant homeowner claimed was created by trial period plan did not satisfy statute of frauds (§ 52-550 [a]), where trial period plan was to be performed within one year and was not agreement for loan in excess of \$50,000.</i>	
Volume 184 Cumulative Table of Cases	197A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries	1B
---------------------	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Active Status of Attorney	1C
Notice of Certification as Authorized House Counsel	1C